

**MINUTES OF THE GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
FEBRUARY 22, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT: CHAIR BOWERS, AYSCUE, FREYALDENHOVEN, HATFIELD, STOUT, WHARTON.

STAFF PRESENT: MIKE COWHIG, STEFAN-LEIH GEARY, Housing and Community Development (HCD); MIKE WILLIAMS, City Attorney's Office.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bowers called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. and welcomed everyone. She said they had a class from UNCG who are studying Preservation Law and Planning. She welcomed all of them.

INTRODUCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

Chair Bowers introduced the Commissioners and staff and gave a brief overview of the procedures that the meeting would follow.

STAFF AND SPEAKERS SWORN OR AFFIRMED

All persons who intended to speak at the meeting, as well as staff, were sworn or affirmed. Chair Bowers said if anyone else decided to speak later, they would be sworn in at that time.

Commissioners confirmed that they had received their packets in a timely manner; no Commissioner had a conflict of interest with regard to any item on the agenda; no Commissioner had discussed any application prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig said the absence of Commissioner Hensley was approved and Commissioner Coleman was supposed to be here at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JANUARY 25, 2006

Mr. Cowhig said staff would bring the January and February minutes to the next meeting for approval.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

a) Application No. 742
Location: 515 Park Avenue
Applicant: Mark R. Zachary
Property Owner: Same
Date Received: 2-8-06 (GRANTED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Replacement of original wood shingle siding with new wood shingle panels. Mr. Cowhig gave some of the history of this house. He presented a sample of the new wood shingle panels the applicant wants to use.

Staff comment and recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines- Exterior Wall Materials and Finishes* (page 44-47), for the following reasons:

Fact

This proposal is for the wholesale replacement of the original siding material, wood shingles, with a wood shingle panel. The proposed replacement material differs from the original material in that it is a sheet instead of individual shingles. The new shingles are slightly thinner than the original; therefore there may be a subtle difference in appearance.

Guideline 1 (page 38): *Preserve original form, materials, and details of exterior walls. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material or detail with new material to match the historic material in composition, size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail. The appropriateness of substitute materials is reviewed based on the size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail as compared to the original material and, when available, past performance of the material in documented cases.*

Guideline 4 (page 38): *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or plywood panels.*

In Support:

Mark Zachary, 677 Percy Street, was sworn or affirmed.

Mindy McReynolds, 604 Summit Avenue, was sworn or affirmed; represented the Aycok Board of Directors.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers said this is Application No. 742 for work at 515 Park Avenue. The applicant is Mark Zachary. The description of the work is to place wood shingle siding with new wood shingle panels. Staff recommended denying the application, while praising the undergoing renovation and speaking of the features of the house. The house has been undergoing renovation for six months to a year. Original features are all being put back and other items are being corrected. Staff showed the Commission a sample of the material being brought in by the applicant with the tapered shingle, bottom to top, maybe slightly thinner than what is there. Ms. Hatfield asked about the integrity and longevity of the product. Staff cited Guidelines 1 and 4, page 47. Beyond that, they talked about the longevity. Staff thought perhaps 25 percent needed to be replaced on the shingle, but was not sure about that. They asked the question if there was anything to prevent the usage of the original materials and there really was not, but we were to wait to hear from the homeowner. The State Historic Office was not contacted about the viability of the new product. Staff was not sure what the current wood was.

Speaking in support of the application was Mark Zachary of 677 Percy Street. He said he had been working on the house for six to 12 months. There was a lot of water damage, no gutters, no insulation and said the original shingles were cedar. He does not feel that he can rescue the existing shingles. The house is from the 1920s and he felt that the life of the shingles had been two times the normal life. He also commented that they were stained with paint on top, which he felt added to the deterioration of the shingles. The new shingle product has insulation properties. It is a true cedar shingle and a very like replacement within 1/16th of an inch of the current appearance. The alternate would be to nail new

shingles in place and he felt that was prohibitively expensive and would be difficult also to blend in the new openings. Mr. Wharton asked a question about the depth and the appearance against reveals of the windows and the homeowner said that the reveals would remain.

Speaking also in support of the application was Mindy McReynolds of 605 Summit Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood. They commended the homeowner on his application and his work on the house and mentioned that he had done extensive renovations and the Board was very much in support of his application.

Discussion:

Ms. Hatfield said part of what the Commission had to do was to ensure that homes remain and are allowed to be updated in a positive way to continue to make them desirable to people. Insulation and replacing siding, when at least 25 percent of the siding needs replacing, does not make much sense to not do it all. Other Commissioners agreed with her.

Ms. Hatfield said she did not feel that it was doing anything but replacing cedar with cedar.

Ms. Ayscue said Page 4 of the Introduction, it talks about how the Guidelines have to be flexible and that we, as Commissioners, can balance the cost of a project against the degree of impact of the change. She felt there was a basis on Page 4 of the Introduction.

Finding of facts:

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 742 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines*, including Design Guidelines related to exterior wall materials and finishes on pages 40-47 and including the Introductory comments to the Guidelines and from the material that was presented to us in the hearing that these are acceptable as findings of fact. Mr. Wharton seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 742 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mark Zachary for work at 515 Park Avenue with the condition that in replacing the siding and using the new siding, that the reveal of the trim around the windows and doors and the shadow lines be substantially similar as they are now. Mr. Wharton seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Ms. Coleman arrived at 4:50 p.m. and participated in the balance of the meeting.

- b) **Application No. 739**
Location: 204 W. Bessemer Avenue
Applicant: David L. Brossoit
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 2-9-06 (GRANTED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Move house from 620 N. Elm Street to 204 W. Bessemer Avenue.

Staff comment and recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines- Building Relocation* (page 71-72) and *Trees and Landscaping* (page 21-23), if certain conditions are met, for the following reasons:

Facts

The house is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. It is scheduled to be demolished unless it is moved. The new site is within the boundaries of the historic district. The house is of a similar style, period and construction materials as several houses along West Bessemer Avenue near the proposed site.

Guideline 1. (page 72): *Review site selection for compatibility of the relocated building to the architectural styles, materials, and scale of existing historic buildings along the street.*

Fact

The proposed site plan shows that the relocated structure will be sited in a manner similar to the surrounding neighborhood in terms of building spacing, setback, orientation, height, scale, and massing.

Guideline 2 (page 72): *Review the compatibility of site selection and proposed siting for a relocated building in terms of building spacing, setback, orientation, height, scale, and massing according to pertinent new construction guidelines.*

Fact

The site plan shows that 10 mature trees ranging in dbh from 10 inches to 42 inches are currently on the property. The application proposes to remove 4 of these trees, ranging in dbh from 10 inches to a sweet gum at 27 inches. Three trees will be removed along the relocation route. A maple tree in the parking area adjacent to Fisher Park and two magnolia trees, one of which is in decline, located at the corner of W. Bessemer and Carolina Street. Additional trees and landscaping will be planted to compensate for those removed including two magnolia trees at W. Bessemer and Carolina Street. No other site features will be disrupted as part of this project.

Guideline 3 (page 72): *Review proposed site landscaping and site features according to pertinent design guidelines.*

Guideline 5 (page 72): *If possible retain important site features including large trees when relocating a building within the Historic District.*

Guideline 5 (page 23): *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*

Guideline 6 (page 23): *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work.*

Fact

Architectural features of the house will be retained when it is relocated.

Guideline 4 (page 72): *Retain important architectural features when relocating a building within the Historic District.*

Conditions

That the Certificate of Appropriateness is issued contingent upon the applicant obtaining all required city, county and state permits and approvals including those from Engineering and Inspections, Transportation, Police and Fire Departments.

That a plan be submitted for commission approval that describes the extent and method for pruning of trees along the route and at the site. Applicant must obtain owner's permission for any pruning and/or removal of STREET TREES.

That a landscape plan be submitted for the site including new site features, walks, driveways, etc. and the size and variety of all new trees.

Any new trees started as part of this project, whether on the 204 Bessemer Site or in the Public right-of way, must survive for at least two seasons or be replaced with a new tree of the same species and size at the applicants responsibility.

The two magnolia trees must be replaced with the same species Magnolia at a size no less than 12 feet in height and 6 feet in limb span diameter and will be the applicants responsibility.

That the tree removals take place not MORE than 30 days prior to the scheduled relocation. Documentation describing the scheduled relocation must be submitted to staff prior to any tree removal. The trees will not be removed until all permits and approvals have been received.

NOTE: If additional trees require removal or pruning, a Certificate of Appropriateness

In Support:

David Brossoit, 201 West Bessemer Avenue, was sworn or affirmed.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers said this is Application No. 739 for moving the house on North Elm Street to 204 West Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is David Brossoit. Staff comment was to approve the application with conditions, citing Guidelines 1 and 2, page 71-72, Guidelines 3 and 5, page 72 and Guidelines 5 and 6, Page 23, and Guideline 4, page 72. The house is a contributing structure and the house is similar to other houses in the neighborhood. It would be sited properly. However, they must remove four trees on the property and three on the relocation route. One of these trees is a Magnolia that is in decline. New trees will be planted and the applicant plans to restore the house. Staff mentioned several conditions. First, the applicant must get all permits from the City. A pruning plan must be submitted to the Commission and to the homeowners. There will need to be a separate COA for landscaping for the new site. New trees must survive for two seasons and be replaced if they die before two seasons. Magnolias should be replaced with Magnolias. The trees should not be removed before 30 days for the move. Any moving and pruning, in addition to what is already applied for, would have to have another COA.

Speaking in support of the application was David Brossoit, 201 West Bessemer. He wants to save the structure and felt this was a rare opportunity to save a house that would otherwise be demolished. He

will return it to single family use. He has spoken with the Neighborhood and he said he would like to amend his application, rather than replacing two trees, he would like to replace six trees and two are Magnolias in front of the new location. The Fisher Park Board supported this application as well as Preservation Greensboro. Most of the owners have been contacted and are on board. He mentioned one property owner, the Oxleys, with whom he had not completed a conversation. He is working with the church and would like to move in May. He has talked to movers, but has not let a contract. They determined the best route without interrupting electrical in the neighborhood. There would be no trimming back on his property.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton said he agreed with Benjamin Briggs that the house is not a renewable resource and the trees are. The trees will grow back so he was definitely in favor of this. The other Commissioners supported it also.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Stout moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 739 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and Guidelines 1 and 2, page 71-72 and Guidelines 3 and 5, page 72, and Guidelines 5 and 6, page 23, and also Guideline 4, page 72 are acceptable as findings of fact. Mr. Wharton seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Stout moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 739 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Brossoit for the work at 204 West Bessemer Avenue, with the following conditions: That the Certificate of Appropriateness is issued contingent upon the applicant obtaining all required City, County and State permits and approvals, including those from Engineering and Inspections, Transportation, and Police and Fire Departments. That the plan be submitted for Commission approval that describes the extent and method for pruning of trees along the route and along the site. Applicant must obtain owner's permission for any pruning and/or removal of street trees with the condition that if those trees are removed that they will have to have new trees of the same species and size mentioned in the following condition. The landscape plan shall be submitted for the site, including new site features, walks, driveways, etc. and the size and variety of all new trees. Any new trees started as part of this project, whether on 204 West Bessemer site or in the public right-of-way must survive for at least two seasons or be replaced with a new tree of the same species and size at the applicant's responsibility. The two Magnolia trees must be replaced with the same species, Magnolia, of a size no less than 12 feet in height and 6 feet in limb span diameter and will be the applicant's responsibility. The park tree needs to be replaced with a tree of the same species as the current tree. That the tool rentals take place no more than 30 days prior to the scheduled relocation. Documentation describing the schedule of relocation must be submitted to staff prior to any tree removal. The tree will not be removed until all permits and approvals have been received. Staff will approve any trees that need to be removed in the future as long as the applicant has the permission of the property owners. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- c) **Application No. 738**
Location: 904 Magnolia Street
Applicant: James E. Chance
Property Owner: Bill and Cathy Sternbergh
Date Application Received: 2-8-06 (GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Landscaping and site improvements.

Staff comment and recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines- Landscaping and Site Features* (page 24) and *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (pages 28-30), if certain conditions are met, for the following reasons:

Fact

The plan includes a 5-6 foot in diameter masonry fishpond for decorative purposes as part of the overall landscaping plan. Small stone or cement fish pools were commonly found in the historic districts. Most have been removed or covered over.

From the Introduction to Fences, Walls and Site Features page 24: *...Historic Site features that may exist on a property include fences, walls, fish pools, trellises, arbors, terraces, patios, and gardens. Many original site features have been lost over the years and every effort should be made to preserve the ones that remain.*

Foundations and fish pools constructed of stone and aggregated concrete were typical historic garden features.

Guidelines Page 73: *Place miscellaneous items such as swimming pools, playground equipment, concrete pads and basketball goals, tree houses, dumpsters, and trash receptacles only in areas such as rear yards, where they are not visible from the street.*

2.

Fact

The landscape plan for the front yard includes a hedge along the front with two low masonry piers at the entrance to the front walkway leading to the house. Hedges that separate public from private space are typical of the historic districts.

From the Introduction to Fences, Walls and Site Features page 24: *Historically, open picket fences, low walls, hedges, and some decorative iron fences were the most typical front yard enclosures. Simple utilitarian fences were commonly used around back yards. Fences usually followed the property line perimeter and did not abut the house. Fountains and fish pools constructed of stone and aggregated concrete were typical historic garden features.*

Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood. It is not appropriate to construct retaining walls of inappropriate materials such as landscape timbers, railroad ties, or concrete blocks where visible from the street. Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location, and size with original fences and walls in the Historic District.

Facts

The existing concrete walkway will be replaced in the same location with a new brick paver walkway in a herringbone pattern. Original brick walkways are found in the historic district some in herringbone patterns.

1. *Retain historic driveways and walkways, including steps and sidewalks, in their original locations. When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original.*
2. *Select appropriate paving materials for new walkways, including concrete, brick, and stone. Simulations of natural materials such as stamped concrete are not appropriate.*

Note:

Clarification is needed in regards to the type of stone proposed for use on the piers.

In Support:

Jim Chance, 903 New Hampshire Drive, Jamestown, was sworn or affirmed; landscape installer contractor.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers said this is Application No. 738 for work at 904 Magnolia Street. The applicant is James Chance. The description of the work is to replace brick walkway, build piers and a general hardscaping. Staff recommended approval with conditions. They previously approved repairs and a tree that was on the application at staff level. The application is for new hardscape, for new piers and a small garden pool. Staff supports the application in general. Another part of the application is a new walkway in a herringbone brick pattern. The one clarification is they would like to see something close to what was originally there. The cited the Introductions to Guidelines, page 24, Guidelines 1 and 2, page 73 and Guidelines ???? and 1 and 2.

Speaking in support of the application was Jim Chance, 903 New Hampshire Drive, Jamestown, and he spoke on behalf of the homeowners, the Sternberg. The yard had just gotten overgrown and the homeowners really wanted to refurbish and have had a landscape designer working with them. They are proposing stone piers out of Tennessee Crabapple Field Stone, 2 inches thick, and would also consider the brick piers. There is a stone wall on the site and there was some granite from that, but there was not enough of that to build two stone piers. Also they considered using brick for the piers. Other materials would be considered, but the homeowners were leaning towards brick.

There was no one to speak in opposition.

Discussion:

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said the fishpond was not mentioned. She said there were brick piers on the porch that may be better. Mr. Stout said staff could approve the brick piers and the walkway was brick.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Stout moved that based on the facts presented in Application No. 738 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic Program Manual and Design Guidelines and staff comments and the following Guidelines, for Walls, Page 73 and Page 24, Fences, Walls and Features, Page 73 are acceptable as findings of fact.

Mr. Wharton seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Stout moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 738 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to James E. Chance, for work at 903 Magnolia Street with the following conditions: That the ???? be constructed out of brick and that the walkway be brick pavers. Ms. Freyaldenhoven seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- d) **Application No. 741**
Location: 833 North Elm Street
Applicant: Bill Guill
Property Owner: Mary Fabrikant
Date Application Received: 2-8-06

Description of Work:

Demolition of accessory structure. Construction of parking area. Request for recommendation for Special Exception to reduce the number of required off street parking spaces from 8 to 3.

Staff comment and recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines- Demolition* (page 73) and *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (pages 28-30), if certain conditions are met, for the following reasons:

Facts

The house at 833 North Elm Street is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The accessory building proposed for demolition behind the house is a non-contributing structure on the national register built in the early 1950's. The applicant is proposing that the accessory structure be demolished to allow off street parking. The property is zoned GOM for office use and the applicant desires to use the property for this purpose. Both the main house and the accessory building are currently used as individual residences; however, the prevailing development pattern along this section of North Elm is office use. In order to use the main building for offices, certain requirements must be met including providing off street parking and landscape improvements. The proposed project may serve as a successful example of adaptive/reuse of a historic property and help ensure that the historic property is preserved.

Guidelines for Demolition (page 73): *The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored. During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions: Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition?*

Could another site serve the purpose just as well? Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs? Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building? As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location? Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance? Is the structure of national, state or local significance?

Fact

The proposed parking area will be small, located at the back of the house and screened with landscaping. City development regulations require that understory trees and shrubs be planted at a rate of trees: 2 for every 100 feet of required planting bed and shrubs: 18 for every 100 feet of required planting bed. The project proposes to plant 1 tree for every 15 feet with shrubs to fill in-between. The change in use will also require additional plantings at the front of the property as well.

Guideline 6 (page 30): *Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.*

Fact

The Special Exception is needed in order to meet the intent of the guidelines. Without it there is no way off street parking could be provided without parking in areas that do not meet the guidelines and/or removal of trees.

Pursuant to Section 30-4-4.2 (B) 2 of the City's Development Ordinance:

"All street setback (except as provided in subsection 1) above), interior setback, building coverage, and height requirements shall comply with applicable zoning regulations unless a special exception is approved by the Board of Adjustment. The special exception shall be granted only if it complies with the intent of the architectural and historic guidelines of the historic district and if first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission."

Conditions

That the effective date of issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition is the date that all permits are obtained from the City for the demolition and the construction of the new parking area.

That the approval of this COA and hence demolition of the accessory building is contingent upon full completion of all components of this application.

That a landscape plan showing specific plant materials, indicating size and location be provided for approval by the commission.

In Support:

Bill Guill, 6116 Lake Brandt Road, Summerfield, previously sworn or affirmed.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers said this is Application No. 741 at 833 North Elm Street. The applicant is Bill Guill and the description of work is the demolition of an accessory structure and removal of one tree and a permit to go for a Special Exception for change in parking requirements from eight to three. Staff recommends approval and cited Guidelines for Demolition, page 73, Guidelines on pages 28-30 and Guideline 5, Page 30. The house is a contributing structure and originally residential. Most houses in

the neighborhood have been destroyed so it was one of the few residentials left in that area. The little house in the back is described as being peculiar. It is a clay tile wall and is a non-contributing structure. For this house to be considered, off street parking is required and landscaping. A Special Exception will need to be granted to reduce the parking spaces from 8 to 3. The parking would be a small area screened and would have to meet City requirements of a Special Exception. Staff mentioned Section 30-4-4.2B(2) of the City's Development Ordinance. The City requires parking to be asphalt and the Commission can make the material a condition of the COA. Later applications would have to be for more complete parking, landscaping, for material, lighting, etc. Also a site plan will have to be approved. This is not complete because the applicant would prefer to get a Conditional COA before going to the Board of Adjustment. Then other COAs would be applied for later. Any modification to the house for handicap accessibility, etc., would require a COA.

Speaking on behalf of the application was Bill Guill of 6116 Lake Brandt Road, Summerfield. He was speaking on behalf of the family of Mary Fabrikant. He said that the homeowner was not planning to move back and put the house up for sale. It had been zoned GO-M and marketed as a residential, but two-thirds of the people looking at it were interested in it as a commercial property. The lot is very small so it is not conducive to residential. It is also surrounded by commercial property. The little house in the back is severely in need of structural overhaul. Fittings are gone and so on. The house is under contract to the Junior League and they want to restore the house and have low-density employees. The question was asked if the tree could be preserved and Mr. Guill said that Carl Myatt and he had gone over the parking lot and could not see how they could save it and still keep their parking.

There was no one else to speak on behalf of the application and there was no one to speak in opposition.

Discussion:

There was a general discussion about what the parking would look like in that backyard without having a landscape plan and knowing the material. Some were hesitant to remove the tree until after the Special Exception was granted. Commissioners did not mind the concept, but did not wish to approve a tree removal with this sort of sketchy landscaping.

Counsel Williams said they could recommend the Special Exception to reduce the parking spaces from 8 to 3 and present to the Board of Adjustment for approval. You could approve or not approve the COA and then there is a motion made regarding the Special Exception that you move to recommend this be a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment. You would basically say that you approved the concept of the removal of the building and have parking in the back, but there is no plan for you to approve that would involve the tearing down of the tree. You would deny the tree removal at this time until such time as you have a completed plan for parking.

Counsel Williams said there were several prongs here. First, there is the removal of the house. Second would be the removal of the tree. The removal of the tree allows for parking in the backyard. So if they wished to vote on the removal of the house and the concept of parking in the backyard that would require somebody to come back with a specific parking plan. You would have to deny the tree removal until such time as a full complete plan was brought to you.

Ms. Hatfield asked if it were permissible for the Commission to approve a portion of a COA and continue a portion of it?

Counsel Williams said they could continue the application for one month, but after that would need the owner's permission to continue anymore.

Mr. Guill said they had an arborist look at the tree. Also if you do any asphalt paving around it, it is going to die.

Mr. Wharton asked if that could not be put as a condition on the COA; "the tree shall not be removed until the Special Exception is granted?"

Mr. Guill said the problem he was having was they could not use this parking scheme because there is no way to present this to the Board of Adjustment without the tree being removed.

Ms. Hatfield said they were not just asking for a conceptual at this point. You want an approval of the scheme as presented?

Mr. Guill said basically that was right since they cannot figure out any other way to get three space in there without doing that. That is the problem. They also need all the requirements for back up and radius and everything that has to be done.

Mr. Cowhig said something that staff has found over the years is that when you've got construction going on and there is a tree close to it, we are better off getting some new trees started than trying to save the tree. You usually end up with the tree dying a season later.

Mr. Wharton said the front had two large Magnolias and the back with the sea of parking.

Mr. Cowhig said he was hoping they could get some trees along the perimeter, at least in that street tree-planting yard, hopefully on either side of the drive.

Mr. Wharton said he actually did not have a problem with the tree removal. We have had previous application where we made an applicant go through a lot of hoops to save a Magnolia tree, which tree is now dead. We ended up with a really messy driveway because of that. There are some good trees on this property in front and he thought if we put a condition on that it come back with a detailed landscape plan, he thought they could address the foliage and the canopy issue then.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 741 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and Guideline No. 6, page 30, and Guidelines for Demolition, page 73, are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Ayscue seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 741 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bill Guill for work at 833 North Elm Street with the following conditions: That the effective date of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition is the date that all permits are obtained from the City for the demolition and the construction of the new parking area. That the approval of this COA and demolition of the accessory building is contingent upon full completion of all components of this application. That a landscape plan showing specific plant materials, indicating the size and location, by provided for approval by the Commission, as well as one showing treating materials, lighting, parking configuration, included handicap parking and handicap access ramp be submitted. And that the Maple tree not be cut down until and unless a Special Exception changing the number of parking spaces from 8 to 3 is granted by the Board of

Adjustment. Ms. Ayscue seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Special Exception:

Mr. Wharton moved that the Commission recommend to the Board of Adjustment that a Special Exception be granted for 833 North Elm Street to reduce the off street parking from 8 spaces to 3 spaces, which is congruent with the *Historic Guidelines* and in the general nature of the historic district. Mr. Stout seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Ayscue, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Stout, Wharton. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig said as part of Commissioner throng, it has been suggested and staff agrees to sit in on a Commission meeting in another community. Staff is hoping to sit in on the Raleigh Historic Districts Commission on March 6. They meet at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. They are in the Municipal Building. Staff would like to know if there are any Commissioners that would like to make a field trip and see how they do it in Raleigh. Apparently Raleigh does have very experienced Commission since they are the oldest Historic Commission in the State. Staff will contact the Commissioners individually to see if their schedule will permit their going on the field trip.

Chair Bowers said Preservation Greensboro was having their annual meeting on March 7th.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

Chair Bowers said the next meeting date is March 29, 2006.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/jd.ps